EXHIBIT 2 to Memo iso Motion to Compel Production

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

HAMPTON ROADS OFFICE:

763 J. Clyde Morris Blvd., Suite 1-A Newport News, Virginia 23601

NORTHERN VIRGINIA OFFICE:

1800 Diagonal Road Alexandria, Virginia 22314 Leonard A Bennett, Esquire lenbennett@clalegal.com (757) 930-3660 Phone (757) 930-3662 Facsimile

REPLY TO: HAMPTON ROADSOFFICE

December 21, 2012

Ryan Rosner
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP
1300 I Street NW
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3314
Email: rrosner@sheppardmullin.com

Anna McLean
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP
4 Embarcadero Center
17th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Email: amclean@sheppardmullin.com

Christopher Michael Loveland
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP
1300 I Street NW
11th Floor East
Washington, DC 20005-3314
Email: cloveland@sheppardmullin.com

Lai Lam Yip
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP
4 Embarcadero Center
17th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Email: lyip@sheppardmullin.com

RE:

Mark F. Guimond and Kallie A. Guimond, et al v. Toyota

Motor Credit Corporation

Civil Action No: 3:12-cv-00606-JAG

Dear Ladies/Gentlemen:

Attached hereto please find the following:

1. Plaintiffs' Objections to First Requests for Production of Documents;

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance herein, I remain

Vicki Ward, Legal Assistant

to Leonard A. Bennett

LAB:vlw Enclosure

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Richmond Division

MARK F. GUIMOND and KALLIE A. GUIMOND, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

C.A. No. 3:12-cv-00606-JAG

v.

TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORPORATION,

Defendant.

PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Comes now, the Plaintiffs, by counsel, and in response to Defendant's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents, state as follows:

REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

Overview

The parties have agreed that neither Plaintiffs' nor Defendants are requesting production of information or documents that are:

- (a) Communications between Plaintiff or Defendant and their counsel regarding this litigation or;
- (b) Document generated by counsel for Plaintiffs' or Defendant in this litigation.
- 1. All documents relating to the lawsuit against Equifax alleged in paragraph 5 of the FAC.

RESPONSE: Objection -

- (a) The documents requested are subject to the mediation privilege and the work product privilege. Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(b)(5), Plaintiff lists the following:
 - Settlement Agreement between Plaintiff and Equifax;
- Settlement communications between Plaintiff and/or his counsel (in that case) and attorneys for Equifax;
 - Communications between the Plaintiff and his attorney in that case;
- (b) Plaintiff also objects as the request seeks discovery of documents with no relevance to this case that could not plausibility lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this case. Plaintiff's counsel has asked of Defendant's counsel on multiple occasions for an explanation as to what relevance or potential use Defendant could obtain to such documents. Defendant's counsel has refused to offer any reasonable explanation. Accordingly, the information sought is beyond the scope of discovery.
- (c) The settlement agreement with Equifax is negotiated as confidential.

 Plaintiffs' counsel has asked Equifax's counsel if it will waive such position and Equifax has refused.
- 2. All documents relating to the allegation in paragraph 5 of the FAC that Mr. Guimond's credit report was "taken offline or frozen by Equifax."

RESPONSERESPONSE: Objection -

- (a) The documents requested are subject to the mediation privilege and the work product privilege. Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(b)(5), Plaintiff lists the following:
 - Settlement Agreement between Plaintiff and Equifax;
- Settlement communications between Plaintiff and/or his counsel (in that case) and attorneys for Equifax;

- Communications between the Plaintiff and his attorney in that case;
- (b) Plaintiff also objects as the request seeks discovery of documents with no relevance to this case that could not plausibility lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this case. Plaintiff's counsel has asked of Defendant's counsel on multiple occasions for an explanation as to what relevance or potential use Defendant could obtain to such documents. Defendant's counsel has refused to offer any reasonable explanation. Accordingly, the information sought is beyond the scope of discovery.
- (c) The settlement agreement with Equifax is negotiated as confidential.

 Plaintiffs' counsel has asked Equifax's counsel if it will waive such position and Equifax has refused.

MARK F. GUIMOND and KALLIE A. GUIMOND,

On their own behalf and behalf of all others similarly situated

Ву

Leonard A. Bennett, VSB #37523 Susan M. Rotkis, Esq. VSB #40693

CONSUMER LITIGATION ASSOCIATES, P.C.

763 J. Clyde Morris Boulevard, Suite 1-A

Newport News, Virginia 23601

Telephone (757) 930-3660

Facsimile (757) 930-3662

lenbennett@clalegal.com

Thomas R. Breeden, VSB#33410 THOMAS R. BREEDEN, P.C. 10326 Lomond Drive Manassas, Virginia 20109 (703) 361-9277 (703) 257-2259 facsimile trb@tbreedenlaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing has been sent by first class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid and via e-mail on this 21st day of December, 2012 to the following:

Ryan Rosner
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP
1300 I Street NW
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3314
Email: rrosner@sheppardmullin.com

Anna McLean
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP
4 Embarcadero Center
17th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Email: amclean@sheppardmullin.com

Christopher Michael Loveland Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP 1300 I Street NW 11th Floor East Washington, DC 20005-3314 Email: cloveland@sheppardmullin.com

Lai Lam Yip
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP
4 Embarcadero Center
17th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Email: lyip@sheppardmullin.com

Counsel for Defendants

Of Counsel